

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

*In re* Patent Application of:

Docket No.: 6192.0099.C1

Sang-Duk LEE, *et al.*

Confirmation No.: 1956

Application No.: 10/608,008

Group Art Unit: 2871

Filed: June 30, 2003

Examiner: Dung T. Nguyen

For: LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY MODULE AND AN ASSEMBLY METHOD  
THEREFOR

**MAIL STOP AF**


Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. BOX 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed June 27, 2005 and further to a Notice of Appeal submitted herewith, Applicant respectfully requests review of the final rejections in the above-identified application in view of the Remarks attached hereafter.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jonathan D. Link  
Reg. No. 41,548

Date: November 22, 2005

**McGuireWoods LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5116  
Fax: 703-712-5279  
JDL/WSC/pjd  
Attachment: Remark

## **REMARK**

In the Final Office Action mailed June 27, 2005 (hereafter "Office Action"), the Examiner finally rejected claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As mentioned in the Request for Reconsideration filed September 16, 2005 (hereafter "Request"), it is submitted that (a) there are clear errors in the Examiner's rejection, and (b) the Examiner has omitted a plurality of essential elements needed for the prima facie rejection.

### **Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,442,470 issued to Hashimoto ("Hashimoto"). It is respectfully submitted that there are clear errors in the Examiner's rejection because certain limitations are not met by Hashimoto.

First, claim 45 recites "the FPC is bent toward the lower surface of the mold frame." In this regard, in the Office Action, the Examiner has not pointed out what portion of Hashimoto discloses or suggests this claimed feature. In fact, the Examiner has not asserted that Hashimoto discloses or suggests this claimed feature. As mentioned in the Request, Fig. 2 of Hashimoto does not show the printed circuit board 3 being bent in any direction. (Request, page 3, lines 25-26) Also, there is no disclosure Hashimoto that the printed circuit board 3 is flexible. (Request, page 3, lines 26-27).

Second, claim 45 recites "a flexible printed circuit (FPC) attached to the display panel." In this regard, in the Office Action, the Examiner has not pointed out what portion of Hashimoto discloses or suggests this claimed feature. In fact, the Examiner

has not asserted that Hashimoto discloses or suggests this claimed feature. As mentioned in the Request, in Hashimoto, the printed circuit board 3 is not attached to the liquid crystal panel 1. (Request, page 3, line 27 to page 4, line 1)

Accordingly, it is submitted that there are clear errors in the Examiner's rejection because certain limitations are not met by Hashimoto.

### **Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto. it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has omitted a plurality of essential elements needed for the prima facie rejection.

As mentioned above, Hashimoto does not disclose or suggest "the FPC is bent toward the lower surface of the mold frame" and "a flexible printed circuit (FPC) attached to the display panel" as recited in claim 45. In fact, the Examiner has not asserted that Hashimoto discloses or suggests these claimed features.

Also, even if the structure shown in Fig. 2 of Hashimoto is modified to have an IC formed on the circuit board 3 as asserted by the Examiner, the modified structure would still fail to show "the FPC is bent toward the lower surface of the mold frame" and "a flexible printed circuit (FPC) attached to the display panel". (Request, page 4, lines 11-15)

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner has omitted a plurality of essential elements needed for the prima facie rejection.